

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-5 and 7-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraphs 1 and 2, and 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Several non-limiting amendments are being made. New claims 24-29 are presented.

The Examiner questioned the use of the term “substrate” (in place of the original” film”) in each independent claim. Each embodiment clearly has a substrate which carries the adhesive pattern. The substrates are, e.g., the film 21 in Figures 1-3; the adhesive note 30 in Figures 4-5; the tape flag 40 in Figures 6-12; and the tape film 50 in Figure 14. The former term “film” might tend to suggest a particular composition or group of compositions and thus might be considered both narrower than “substrate,” as well as potentially inconsistent from embodiment to embodiment. Therefore, no amendment is believed to be needed.

The term “direct contact” has been changed to --contact-- as suggested by the Examiner. This is not considered to narrow the claims, but merely clarifies them. As explained in the last amendment, the language “an adhesive section ... is in contact with [a] side [of the substrate]” is patentably distinguishable from the condition in the cited Leander reference, which requires an additional release layer to be added between an adhesive section and a corresponding side of the substrate in order to prevent adhesion. No release layer is required according to the present invention.

The Examiner was not able to understand claims 7 and 17. Clarifying, non-limiting amendments have been made. Claims 7 and 17 correspond at least to the tape dispenser of Figures 6-13 and the corresponding text.

The Examiner questioned whether there is support in the disclosure for the respective last paragraphs of claims 1 and 2. These paragraphs are clearly supported by Figures 1(a) and 1(b) and the corresponding text.

The Examiner questioned whether there is support in the disclosure for claims 20-23. Support is found in original claim 6. Attached hereto is a proposed new Figure 4(a). Corresponding amendments are being made in the specification. Approval is requested.

Claim 10, 11 and 20-23 were rejected as being obvious over the admitted prior art in view of Leander. The comments on the prior art in the amendment of September 5, 2003, are still appropriate and the Examiner is requested to review them. For the reasons therein, claims 10, 11 and 20-23 are submitted to be allowable.

In view of the foregoing, allowance of claims 1-5 and 7-29 is requested.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on April 26, 2004:

James A. Finder


Name of applicant, assignee or  
Registered Representative

Signature

April 26, 2004

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Finder

Registration No.: 30,173

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone: (212) 382-0700

JAF:msd  
Enclosure